

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,703	01/12/2001		David Lee Benson	P04847US0 PHI 1379 2741	
27142	7590	11/06/2003		EXAMINER	
MCKEE, V	OORHE	ES & SEASE, P.L.	MEHTA, ASHWIN D		
ATTN: PIO				1071007	
801 GRANI	D AVENU	E, SUITE 3200	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721				1638	

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/759,703	BENSON, DAVID LEE	
, (at / at	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ashwin Mehta	1638	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ars on the cover sheet with th	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average in a condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a name application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 12 as set forth in (b) above, if checked.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			
(a) they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	·		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without cancell	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-7,51,52 and 54</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: 20 and 50.			
Claim(s) rejected: 8,42-49,53 and 55-63.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	 ·	
10. Other:		A A Al	
		ASHWIN D. MEHTA, PH.D PATENT EXAMINER	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On page 8, 4th full paragraph of the response, Applicant states, "Applicant acknowledges the addition of new claims 64 through 91 as specifically stated by the claims faxed by ExamIner David Fox on November 15, 2002 and the new sample claim submitted by Supervisory Patent Examiner Amy Nelson via e-mail on August 7, 2003 and revised via telephone on August 25, 2003." However, the new claims were not faxed to Applicant by Examiner Fox, nor did he indicate to Applicant that the new claims were deemed acceptable for the instant application. Further, neither SPE Nelson nor Examiner Fox indicated in any communication that the "new sample claims" were acceptable for the instant case, in which the invention centers on a hybrid maize seed.